

Application Number 09/653,701
Amendment dated November 21, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004

R-E-M-A-R-K-S

Claims 1, 3-10 remain in the application. In order to accelerate prosecution of this application, the Applicant amends claim 1 to incorporate the limitations from claim 2. Consequently, claim 2 is canceled without prejudice.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable in view of Frink et al. (US Patent N°6,678,002).

The Applicant courteously disagrees with the Examiner for the reasons discussed below.

Firstly, the Examiner states that element 104 of Fig. 1F in '002 contains a graphics processor, but never refers to any element in 104 as having graphics processing function per se. The Applicant submits that to meet the anticipation criteria, a graphics processor for "video editing" (see claim 1 preamble) needs to be present in '002. This is not the case. In fact, '002 is limited to visualization of effects and rendering of video data and not editing. This is clear for the abstract of '002 which states in part "[The] system provides real-time previsualization of effects to be added to high-definition (HD) video data and real-time rendering of the HD video data including the added effects".

Secondly, the Examiner states that "Figure 2 of '002 shows the codec 216 acts as a video decoder having a video signal from the router 220 and thereby gives an uncompressed or compressed video output to the output device 240". If this is the case, the limitation of claim 2 cannot be anticipated by '002. The limitation of claim 2 incorporated in claim 1 states that "said video decoder using said first video bus to transfer data to said video encoder in a non-editing playback mode, and said video decoder using said first video bus to transfer data to said codec in a video capture mode." As shown in Fig. 1 of the present application, this limitation shows that the first bus (40) is shared by the output of the graphics processor (36), the encoder (27), the codec (12) and video decoder (11) thereby permitting bypassing the compression of data by a codec and the processing of data by a graphics processor in, for example, non-editing playback mode. Clearly, this is not the case in '002. According to the Applicant's

Application Number 09/653,701
Amendment dated November 21, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004

understanding of the Examiner's interpretation of '002, the video data must be fed to the codec ("which also acts as the video decoder") and eventually to a graphics processor which the Examiner fails to identify and the Applicant fails to find in '002.

The Applicant therefore believes that claim 1 is not anticipated and is therefore is patentable in view of '002.

The Applicant further believes that claims 3-10 are patentable in view of '002 as they are dependent from a claim which is believed to be patentable.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the rejection of amended claim 1 and claims 3-10 is respectfully requested. It is believed that claims 1, 3-10 are allowable over the prior art and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorne Trottier et al.

By:




C. Marc Benoit (Reg. No. 50,200)
Agent of Record
Ogilvy Renault
1600 - 1981 McGill College Avenue
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2Y3

Tel: (514) 847-4462

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

C. Marc BENOIT, Reg. No. 50,200
Name of person signing certification



Signature

November 21, 2004

Date